

following the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Justice's conclusions are supposed to be the final word in the executive branch about what is lawful or not, and the administration has emphasized since the warrantless wiretapping story broke that it was being done under the department's supervision.

Now, it emerges, they were willing to override Justice if need be. That Mr. Gonzales is now in charge of the department he tried to steamroll may be most disturbing of all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FORMER U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is the 125th day since two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison.

Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted in Federal court for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas. These agents should have been commended for their actions, but instead the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted full immunity to the drug smuggler. The extraordinary details surrounding the prosecution of this case assure that justice has not been served.

In an interview this Friday, May 18, 2007, with Glenn Beck of CNN Headline News, U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton again repeated a false claim about this case, stating that the agent shot "an unarmed guy in the back." That is his quote.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how anyone, especially this Federal prosecutor, would choose to accept the word of a criminal over two law enforcement officers who have sworn to uphold the Constitution and to protect the American people. Yet this prosecutor believed the word of a drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed. It is a sad day in this Nation when a criminal has more influence over a Federal prosecutor than two law enforcement officers. I am going to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. It is a sad day in this Nation when a criminal has more influence over a Federal prosecutor than two law enforcement officers.

Both agents testified that the drug smuggler turned and pointed an object at them while he was running away, and they fired in self-defense. An Army doctor who removed the bullet fragment from the drug smuggler confirmed that the bullet entered into his lower left buttocks, passed through his pelvic triangle, and lodged in his right thigh, not in the back, as Mr. Sutton has repeatedly claimed. At the trial,

the Army doctor testified that the drug smuggler's body was "bladed" away from the bullet that struck him, consistent with the motion of a left-handed person running away while pointing backward, causing the body to twist.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one logical object that the drug smuggler would have pointed at the agents in this circumstance: a firearm.

In addition to this physical evidence, an article published by the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin on October 26, 2006, quotes two of the drug smuggler's family members who said, and I quote, "He has been smuggling drugs since he was 14 and would not move drugs unless he had a gun on him." That is his own family that made a statement.

The facts have shown what countless citizens and Members of Congress already know: That the U.S. Attorneys office was on the wrong side of this issue and this case.

I am pleased and grateful that Chairman CONYERS and Chairman LEAHY have shown interest in holding hearings to investigate the injustice committed against these two Border Patrol agents. The conviction of these two agents is a travesty that cries out for oversight, and I hope that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will say thank you to Mr. CONYERS and also to Chairman LEAHY because they are willing to look for the truth and justice instead of injustice.

And I call on the President of the United States to, please, Mr. President, look at this case and pardon these two border agents that were only trying to protect the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WORLD BANK AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address two issues involving international economics. The first is the World Bank.

The entire world has been fixated on whether Mr. Wolfowitz arranged \$195,000 for his paramour, which shows how little attention we pay to things at the World Bank that really matter. Because while we were focused on that, no one focused in the media on the fact that the World Bank is sending over

\$1.3 billion, roughly a quarter of it our tax dollars, to the government of Iran.

Now we are told that this is for wonderful projects in Iran having nothing to do with the government. We here in the House understand something about politics. One of the ways you get re-elected, one of the ways the Iranian government holds on to power is to bring home the bacon. I know it's not kosher, I know it is not halal, but that's what that government does, and the World Bank helps them do it.

Now, we saw how did the United States use its clout inside the World Bank? Not to stop these loans to Iran and not to stop their disbursements, over \$200 million being disbursed by Mr. Wolfowitz himself, but for only two goals. One was to try to prevent the World Bank from being involved in family planning; and the other was to protect Mr. Wolfowitz's career, notwithstanding his errors of judgment.

Where is this administration when it comes to prioritizing and representing the national security interests of this country? Iran is developing nuclear weapons, and all we can do with our clout in the World Bank is try to protect one individual of flawed judgment.

Second, I would like to address the idea of granting Fast Track to this administration. I am sure that when the President seeks an extension of Fast Track, he will offer those of us on the Democratic side all kinds of wonderful promises. But keep one thing in mind: Any trade deal that requires on this President for enforcement will be enforced only to the extent this President wants it enforced.

Look at the Iran Sanctions Act. This President refuses to acknowledge that any facts exist that require him to even decide what to do with regard to investments in Iran.

I assure you that if we sign a deal with the best possible labor standards but Presidential enforcement and something were to come to pass, perhaps a coup in Peru and all of a sudden every labor leader in the country is shot in cold blood, this President will not act to enforce those labor standards. He may express some concerns, but any agreement involving our trade which requires this President to acknowledge facts occurring on the ground is a nullity except to the extent that the President chooses to. Because we could have a circumstance where there is no enforcement of corporate interests without Presidential action, and he will act; and we could have a circumstance where there is no enforcement of labor standards without Presidential action, and you can be sure he will not.

So I look forward to changing the policies of this administration. Let us hope that at the World Bank we focus on preventing loans to Iran, rather than irrelevancies involving one particular paramour; and let us hope that this House takes responsibility, its responsibilities under article I of the Constitution to deal with international